

ATTACHMENT L-5: PAST PERFORMANCE LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE

(For each referenced contract for which the work was not performed for DOE's Office of Environmental Management (EM) and for which no contractor performance data is available in PPIRS, the Contractor shall provide the Attachment L-5 Past Performance Letter and Questionnaire to the client identified on the Attachment L-4.)

Sample Past Performance Letter

Dear _____:

We are participating in a procurement for a Department of Energy (DOE) Contract for the Los Alamos National Laboratory NRDA acquisition. We are asking for your assistance in completing the attached questionnaire and forwarding to the DOE to aid in its evaluation of our past performance.

Please return the completed questionnaire within ten calendar days.

YOU ARE HIGHLY ENCOURAGED TO SCAN AND EMAIL THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE EMAIL ADDRESS PROVIDED BELOW:

Email Address: dustin.dalton@emcbc.doe.gov

If you are unable to scan and email a copy, it can be mailed to the following address:

United States Department of Energy
Environmental Management Consolidated Business Center
Office of Contracting, Attn: Mr. Dustin Dalton
250 E 5th Street
Suite 500
Cincinnati, OH 45202

If mailing, please mark the envelope:

“PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104”

“TO BE OPENED ONLY BY THE CONTRACTING OFFICER”

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE:

A. REFERENCED CONTRACT AND CLIENT INFORMATION

Name of Company Being Evaluated:

Evaluator's Name:

Evaluator's Address:

Evaluator's Phone:

Evaluator's Organization:

Evaluator's role in the management of the contract:

B. RATING SCALE AND DEFINITIONS:

Rating	Definition	Note
Exceptional	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.	To justify an Exceptional rating, identify multiple significant events and state how they were of benefit to the Government. A singular benefit, however, could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also, there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.
Very Good	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.	To justify a Very Good rating, identify a significant event and state how it was a benefit to the Government. There should have been no significant weaknesses identified.
Satisfactory	Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.	To justify a Satisfactory rating, there should have been only minor problems, or major problems the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract/order. There should have been NO significant weaknesses identified. A fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that contractors will not be evaluated with a rating lower than Satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract/order.
Marginal	Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.	To justify Marginal performance, identify a significant event in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the Government. A Marginal rating should be supported by referencing the management tool that notified the contractor of the contractual deficiency (e.g., management, quality, safety, or environmental deficiency report or letter).
Unsatisfactory	Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains a serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.	To justify an Unsatisfactory rating, identify multiple significant events in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the Government. A singular problem, however, could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an unsatisfactory rating. An Unsatisfactory rating should be supported by referencing the management tools used to notify the

		contractor of the contractual deficiencies (e.g., management, quality, safety, or environmental deficiency reports, or letters).
--	--	--

C. ASSESSMENT AREAS:

1. Quality of Product or Service

☐ Exceptional
☐ Very Good
☐ Satisfactory
☐ Marginal
☐ Unsatisfactory
☐ Not Applicable
☐ Do Not Know

Supporting Narrative:

2. Schedule Compliance

☐ Exceptional
☐ Very Good
☐ Satisfactory
☐ Marginal
☐ Unsatisfactory
☐ Not Applicable
☐ Do Not Know

Supporting Narrative:

3. Cost Control

☐ Exceptional
☐ Very Good
☐ Satisfactory
☐ Marginal
☐ Unsatisfactory
☐ Not Applicable
☐ Do Not Know

Supporting Narrative:

4. Business Relations

☐ Exceptional
☐ Very Good
☐ Satisfactory
☐ Marginal
☐ Unsatisfactory
☐ Not Applicable
☐ Do Not Know

Supporting Narrative:

5. Management of Key Personnel

☐ Exceptional
☐ Very Good
☐ Satisfactory
☐ Marginal
☐ Unsatisfactory
☐ Not Applicable
☐ Do Not Know

Supporting Narrative:

6. Utilization of Small Business

☐
Exceptional

☐
Very Good

☐
Satisfactory

☐
Marginal

☐
Unsatisfactory

☐
Not
Applicable

☐
Do Not
Know

Supporting Narrative: